

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended.

Claims 1-2, 5-8, 19-20, 26, 28-29, 32-33 and 35 have been amended. Claims 3-4, 10-18, 21-22, 24, 27, 30-31, 34 and 37-45 have been cancelled without prejudice. Therefore, claims 1-2, 5-9, 19-20, 23, 25, 26, 28-29, 32-33 and 35-36 are presented for examination.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-4, 7-12, 15, 18-22, 25-31, 34-39, 42 and 45 as best understood are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Richards, U.S. Patent No. 6,069,957 (“Richards”).

Richards discloses transmitting keys “as a hierarchy, wherein one key unlocks another key, and the last key unlocked is sometimes called ‘key-upon-key’ encryption” (Abstract). Richards further discloses “distribution is typically accomplished by sending to each customer the decryption keys, but in encrypted form. *Each customer’s decryption hardware is assigned a unique customer-key. The decryption keys are encrypted using the customer-keys, so that each customer’s hardware can obtain only the decryption keys intended for it*” (col. 4, lines 63-67).

In contrast, claim 1, in pertinent part, recites “recovering a content key from the list of update keys by recovering a set of update keys for each receiver from the multiple nested list of decryption patterns and using the set of update keys to decrypt the content key, wherein the valid receivers receive the recovered content key to facilitate decryption of content, and each of the invalid receivers receives a distinct intermediate key to facilitate blocking of the content” (emphasis provided).

In Richards, the assigning of a unique customer-key to each customer's decryption hardware which is then used to obtain only the description keys intended for it is not the same as recovering a content key from the list of update keys by recovering a set of update keys for each receiver from the multiple nested list of decryption patterns and using the set of update keys to decrypt the content key as recited by claim 1. Further, Richards does not teach or reasonably suggest providing the content key to all valid receivers, while providing a distinct intermediate key to each of the invalid receivers as recited by claim 1. Richards fails to teach or reasonably suggest all the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Claims 19 and 28 contain limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 19 and 28 and their dependent claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 5-6, 13-14, 16-17, 23-24, 32-33, 40-41 and 43-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards, in view of Uz, U.S. Patent No. 6,351,538 (“Uz”).

Claims 13-14, 16-17, 24, 40-41 and 43-44 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 5-6, 23 and 32-33 depend from one of independent claims 1, 19 and 28 and thus they include all the limitations of their base claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5-6, 23 and 32-33.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: May 5, 2005


Aslam A. Jaffery
Reg. No. 51,841

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980